

John of Padua.

By the Rev. Canon J. E. JACKSON, F.S.A.

WHO was John of Padua?

This is a question which has been very often asked, but has never yet been satisfactorily answered. Yet an answer, if one could be found, ought to be interesting to Wiltshire people, seeing that this person is traditionally said to have designed the finest house in their county—Longleat, the seat of the Marquis of Bath. He is not named by our oldest topographers, Leland and Camden, and the writer who appears the first to mention him is Walpole, in his "Anecdotes of Painters," where Dallaway, the editor, adds, in a note :—"But who was John of Padua? what was his real name? how educated? and what were his works previous to his arrival in England? No research has hitherto discovered with satisfaction."¹ Mr. Digby Wyatt also, in a very interesting essay (1868) "On the Foreign Artists employed in England in the Sixteenth Century," says :—"No research has yet clearly made out who 'Johannes de Padua,' the celebrated architect who mainly took the place of Holbein as Henry the Eighth's chief designer, really was."²

In the following paper I propose to shew

I. Who "John of Padua" may really have been.

II. What little probability there is that he could have had anything to do with the building of Longleat.

I.—All that is hitherto really known about him is, that at Easter 34 Hen. VIII. (A.D. 1542), he began to be employed in the service of King Henry, and that two years afterwards, by letters patent dated 30th June, 1544, an allowance was granted to him (the payment commencing retrospectively from Easter, 1542) of two shillings a day "for good service in *architecture and various nee*

¹ "Anecdotes of Painting," Edit. 1828, vol. i., p. 216.

² Mr. Sarsfield Taylor has some severe remarks upon the style of architecture reputed to have been introduced by Holbein and the un-identified John of Padua. ("Origin of the Fine Arts," vol. i., 243 and 262.)

compositions in music," taking that to be the right meaning of the original words "in architecturâ et variis in Re Musicâ inventis." Such is the substance of the following patent, given by Rymer :—¹

"Pro servitio in Architecturâ et Musicâ.

"A.D. 1544. Rex omnibus ad quos, &c., Salutem.

"Sciatis quod Nos de gratiâ nostrâ speciali, ac ex certâ scientiâ et mero motu nostris, necnon in consideratione boni et fidelis servitii quod dilectus serviens noster *Johannes de Padua* nobis in Architecturâ ac aliis in re Musicâ inventis impendit ac impendere intendit. Dedimus et concessimus ac per Presentes damus et concedimus eidem *Johanni* Vadium sive Feodum *Duorum Solidorum sterlingorum per diem* Habendum et annuatim percipiendum *præfato Johanni* dictum Vadium sive Feodum *Duorum Solidorum* durante Beneplacito nostro, de Thesauro nostro ad Receptam scaccarii nostri per manus Thesaurariorum et Camerariorum nostrorum ibidem pro tempore existentium, ad Festa S^{ti} Michaelis Archangeli et Paschæ per æquales Portiones.

"Et insuper Sciatis quod cum dictus *Johannes* nobis inservivit in dictâ Arte à *Festo Paschæ* quod erat in Anno Regni nostri 34^{to}, prout certam habemus notitiam Nos de uberiori Gratiâ nostrâ Dedimus et concessimus *eidem Johanni* præfatum Feodum *Duorum Solidorum* per diem Habendum et percipiendum eidem a dicto Festo Paschæ Nomine Regardi nostri.

"Et quod expressa mentio, &c.

"Teste Rege apud Westm^r. 30 die Junii.

"*Per Breve de Privato Sigillo.*"

The patent was renewed on 25th June, 1549 (3 Edw. VI.)² in precisely the same words (*mutatis mutandis*), and with the order of retrospective payment from Easter, 1 Edward VI. The only difference was, that the salary in the former one was "during the King's pleasure": in the latter "for life."

These patents have often been quoted as authority to prove that Henry VIII. was the first who introduced a new officer about the Court, under the title of "Devizer of the King's Buildings": but no such title appears in them. It occurs only in an Office Book which Walpole saw, in which the entry is made of the annual payment of £36 10s. to John of Padua, Devizer of the King's Buildings. This payment continued till the reign of Philip and Mary,³ but still no mention of the particular work paid for. The

¹ "Fœdera," vol. xv., 34, Edit. 1713.

² "Rymer," xv., 189.

³ Daines Barrington to Rev. Mr. Norris, "Nichols's Literary History," vol. v., p. 602, referring to "a MS. of the then Royal Household, which I had the honour of presenting to the Society of Antiquaries."

only palace on which King Henry was engaged at his death was Nonesuch, near Cheam, in Co. Surrey, now long since entirely destroyed. This fantastical and costly building was one on which some very novel and un-English ideas in architecture were indulged: and it is possible (though there is no evidence to show it) that the Italian new-comer may have brought those fanciful ideas with him.¹

It is only a tradition that he was employed by Protector Somerset upon Old Somerset House, in the Strand:² and Sir John Thynne, the founder of Longleat, having been closely and officially connected with the Protector, the same tradition extends to the designing of Longleat. And because there are other houses in the West of England that are built somewhat in the style of Longleat (as, for instance, Kingston, or the Duke's House, at Bradford-on-Avon), for this, and for no other conceivable reason, topographers, and guide-book compilers, copying from one another, and without any other authority, persist in referring them to this John of Padua. Walpole would give him Sion House, in Middlesex. "Much," says Mr. M. D. Wyatt most justly,³ "is attributed to him that is apocryphal." Instead of "much" I am rather disposed to say "all": that is, so far as regards his having been the sole contriver and arranger of the architecture of any large house. For the fact is that not a single scrap of documentary *evidence* has ever been produced of any work, great or small, in which he was engaged.

In the "*Vetusta Monumenta*," vol. iv., the Gate of Honour at Caius College, Cambridge, there delineated, is also ascribed to him, but quite erroneously. Still, in the middle of the last century, his

¹ Nonesuch palace was an expensive toy left unfinished by King Henry: the grounds filled with statues, pyramids, fountains, Dianas and Acteons, &c. "The whole front of the house was faced with plaster work, made of rye-dough, in imagery very costly." (MS. note in Le Neve's copy of Aubrey's "Surrey."). There is an engraving of this very singular palace, by Hoffnagle, copied in "*Lysons' Environs of London*," vol. i., 153: also in "*Nichols's Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*": and on the margin of Norden and Speed's Map of the Co. of Surrey: but the most complete is in Braun's "*Orbis Terrarum*," 1572.

² "A mixture of the most heterogeneous conceits." "A piebald mass of masonry." (Mr. Sarsfield Taylor.)

³ "The Builder," 20th June, 1868.

name, for some reason or other, had found its way to Caius College : for Dr. Ducarel, of the Society of Antiquaries, says in a letter to Mr. Lethieullier, 1750, October 24th :—" In Caius College I saw this summer the picture of John of Padua, a famous architect who built that college and [old] Somerset House, on the old front of which next the Strand remain to this day some old Doric columns like those at Caius." Here, as the late Dr. Guest of that college informed me, Dr. Ducarel was mistaken : the portrait is that of Theodore Have, an architect from Cleves, who worked at the building of the college with Dr. Caius himself.¹

Some, again, in a despairing effort to make out who John of Padua was, have suggested that he was no other than the celebrated English architect John Thorpe, who, after studying abroad at Padua, on returning home may have adopted the name of the city instead of his own. The late John Britton, in his "Dictionary of Architecture,"² considers this notion strengthened "by the fact that plans of Somerset House, in London, and *Longleat*, the most generally acknowledged works of John of Padua, are among Thorpe's drawings in the Soane Museum." Here Mr. Britton was certainly in error, as to *Longleat*. In the list of contents of Thorpe's volume of drawings, given by Dallaway,³ the name of *Longleat* does not appear : and I have myself searched the volume very carefully, and was unable to find any plans or portions of plans of *Longleat* in it. That John Thorpe was John of Padua seems to be a mere idle guess which may be at once dismissed.

So again, the question recurs, "Who could he be?"

One, and perhaps the principal reason, why those who have tried

¹ This portrait is thus described by Walpole ("Anecdotes of Painting," i., p. 323, Dallaway's Edit., 1828) :—"An old picture (bad at first and now almost effaced by cleaning) of a man in a slashed doublet, dark curled hair and beard, looking like a foreigner, and holding a pair of compasses, and by his side a polyhedron, composed of twelve pentagons. This is undoubtedly Theodore Have himself." Be this as it may, it used to be called "John of Padua" : and all care about it is that the curious "polyhedron with twelve pentagons," painted in the corner, may presently help me to account for that person's name being met with at all in connection with Caius College.

² Under the head of "Padua, John of."

³ "Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting," vol. i., p. 330.

to answer it, have missed the scent, is that, being called in English John of Padua, it has been always taken for granted that he must have been either a native, or a citizen of that city. In that case it would follow that his own family name had been dropped, and that "*par excellence*," through some easy superiority to all other "Johns" in the same branch of art, the public voice had glorified the city by connecting his Christian name with it. Such, for example, was the case of Raffaele *Sanzio* (his family name), more commonly spoken of as Raffaele *D'Urbino* (the place of his birth) : or, again, Pietro *Vannucci*, more famous as Pietro *Perugino* (from the town of Perugia).

But this can hardly have been the case with our "John of Padua." For, in the first place, in such a document as royal letters patent, a foreigner, who had any family name at all, would never have been loosely described as William of Rome, George of Naples, or John of Padua.

Many of the great Italian artists, it is true, are best known by their Christian names only, as Raffaele, Guido, Michael Angelo, &c., and where the Christian name was a common one the mouth of the public sometimes appended the name of the place. All Italy knows in a moment who is meant by John of Bologna, but of John of Padua nobody in Italy appears to know anything. In our country also, we have very old historians who are known to us only as "John of Salisbury," "Richard of Devizes," and others. The clergy, more particularly, were named from their homes. In the episcopal registers at Salisbury, the greater part of the earliest entries (the end of the thirteenth century) are in that form : for no other reason than that family names were at that time unsettled and uncertain. The country clergy, more particularly, being generally of humble origin, could only be distinguished by the name of the village they belonged to, as "William of Edington," "William of Wykeham, &c. In this way names of places ultimately became family names. But family names had long been settled in England before Henry VIII., and in Italy for centuries before that.

Again, a man of European reputation might be expected to have left, in his own country, at all events, some master-pieces of work, or some undisputable records of his work, which is certainly not the case in this instance.

The historians also of Padua, had he really been a native of that place and very conspicuous as an architect, would not have omitted to claim so famous a son.

It was by mere accident that I was led to the explanation which I venture now to submit, of the mystery which so long surrounded the name of John of Padua.

In turning over a number of curious old volumes that had been rescued from destruction in the garret of a farm-house I met with a thin little quarto, the title of which was "**JOANNIS PADUANII Veronensis opus de compositione et usu multiformium Horologiorum Solarium.**" [*John Paduanus of Verona, on the construction and use of Sun-dials of various shapes.*] "Printed at Venice, 1570." Happening at the moment to remember (what I have already mentioned) that at Caius College, Cambridge, there is a picture with a curious *sun-dial* painted on the corner, which picture Dr. Ducarel understood to be that of "*John of Padua*," the coincidence of the names and circumstances struck me as remarkable.

This sun-dial at Caius College, it should be mentioned, stood formerly (for it has long since disappeared) on a column in the court of the college. Being constructed on twelve pentagons, each pentagon having of course, five faces, it presented sixty dials. The annals of the house record that it was set up by Theodore Have, in the year 1576. There is a miserable little sketch of the column on which it stood, in Loggan's print of that College. Now, though Theodore Have may have set up this curious sun-dial, still, he may have been assisted in its construction, either by Joannes Paduanus in person, or by the rules in his book on that subject, printed in 1570, a few years before; and this, perhaps, may be enough to account for the name of John of Padua being mentioned at all at the college. At any rate it brings John *de Padua* into such striking concurrence with Joannes *Paduanus* that it is difficult to believe they were not one and the same person.¹

¹ The usage of Latin grammar would suggest *Paduanus* rather than *Paduanus*: but neither of them is classically correct. Livy, the Roman historian, a native of Patavium (*Anglicè* Padua) was "*T. Livius Patavinus.*"

But Joannes Paduanus was "of Verona": not of Padua. If then John de Padua was the same person as J. Paduanus, the inference is plain that "de Padua" was his *family name*, Verona his home.

Then, is anything known about Joannes Paduanus? It is quite certain that there was at that time, and had been for many years before, in the North of Italy, a family of this very name, called variously, Paduanus, de Padua, or (in Italian) dei Padovani. In 1476 a work had been printed at Venice, called "*Alberti de Padua* *solemne opus, &c.*": being a treatise on the Lord's Day and the festivals, as mentioned in the New Testament.¹ And in such of those treatises of John Paduanus as, written by him in Latin, were afterwards translated into Italian, the author is called "*Giovanni dei Padovani.*"²

Furthermore, it is certain, not only that it was, but that it is still, an Italian family name: for curiously enough, even while writing out this paper for the press, I met in the *Times* newspaper with an account of a horrible murder in a railway carriage near Bologna, on the 14th of this present January, 1886, the unfortunate victim's name being Pietro *Padovani*, of Anguilla, near *Venice*.

From all the circumstances above mentioned, it may now, perhaps, be considered probable that the person whom, in English, we call John of Padua, may have been no other than Giovanni Padovani, of Verona, the author of the work on sun-dials.

¹ A copy occurs in the catalogue of the Syson Park Library, sold last year.

² The prefix of "De" was thought (and the idea is not yet quite obsolete, even in our own country) to denote less of the plebeian and more of the aristocratic quality. At the period alluded to it had become so much in vogue as to call for a slight rebuke even from the pen of Erasmus. In the colloquy called "*The Hippeus Anippos*" (The Horse-less Horse-man), a person of humble origin suddenly becoming rich, wishes to be instructed how to assume the properties and appearance of a gentleman. His counsellor suggests, first of all, a coat of arms (of course of a ludicrous kind), and then adds, "But if your name should happen to be '*Philippus Comensis*,' be very careful to alter it to '*Philippus De Como*.'" The editor of Erasmus, in a note, says, "The principal families of Italy were wont to write and announce their names in this way. Hundreds of examples may be found in Italian authors of the prepositions '*a*' and '*de*' thus prefixed to the name of some city, village, or even private estate."

There are in the British Museum several other treatises by him, viz., "On Arithmetic," "Chronology," "Instructions for Songs by the Harmony of many Voices," "Mathematics," "Astronomy," &c. The names are given in the note.¹ These show him to be a man of various accomplishments.

There is another curious coincidence of circumstances that might help to identify this Giovanni dei Padovani with the John of Padua employed by Henry VIII.

Referring to the letters patent we find that, besides his skill in architecture, whatever that may have been, he was engaged in King Henry's service on account of his "*compositions and novelties in music.*"

From Mr. D. Wyatt's essay, already referred to, I borrow some remarks upon the King's fondness for music, and foreign performers. "Henry's own gifts as a musician were of no mean order, and his protection of everything connected with music was most liberal. In a letter from Nicolo Sagudino, Secretary to the Venetian Embassy,

¹ On the Horoscope. "Opera nuova di Giovanni dei Padovani, Veronese, Verona. 1580." In the preface to this he says that some years before he had constructed astronomical instruments of various kinds, as astrolabes, quadrants, &c., &c.

2. "Joannis Paduanii, Veronensis, Liberalium Artium Professoris, Viridarium Mathematicorum," in which he professes to deal with various difficulties in astronomy. Venice, 1563.

3. "Opusculum" on the variation of the year and changes of festivals. Verona, 1575.

4. On singing by harmony of many voices. Verona, 1578.

5. On the construction of sun-dials of various forms. Venice, 1570 and 1582.

6. On the composition and division of time. Verona, 1586.

7. On the true day of Our Lord's Passion. Verona, 1586.

8. On arithmetic. Verona, 1587.

9. On the parts of the human body. Verona, 1589.

10. "Consummata Sapientia, seu Philosophia Sacra PRAXIS DE LAPIDE MINERALI." A curious medley of theology and chymistry. This was also translated into German, as the work of "Johannes de Padua." It was originally written in 1557, but not printed till 1602. The author had not himself intended to publish it at all, but had ordered it to be kept secret and shewn only to genuine lovers of the art. The editor, M. Schumbert, says that the original MS. of 1557 was so worn by perusal that he had the greatest difficulty in decyphering it when it came into his hands.

Whether John Paduanus was the author of any work on architecture, or not, I cannot say. There is none in the British Museum Library.

dated June 6th, 1515" [this, however, was in an earlier part of Henry's reign], "to one of the Foscari, there is an excellent description of the magnificent entertainment given to the ambassador at Greenwich. After the banquet they were taken into rooms containing a number of organs, harpsichords, flutes, and other musical instruments, where the prelates and nobles were assembled to see the jousts then in preparation. The ambassador told some of these grandees that he (Sagudino) was a proficient on some of those instruments. He was consequently asked to play, and did so for a long time, being listened to with great attention. Among the listeners was a Brescian, to whom the King gave 300 ducats a year for playing the lute, and who took up his instrument and played a few things with him (Sagudino). Afterwards two musicians, also in the King's service (it is to be hoped they were not Englishmen), *played the organ, but very badly*: they kept bad time, their touch was feeble, and their execution not very good. The King practises on these instruments day and night." In another passage of his letter Sagudino asks for *new music* from Venice, especially some compositions of *Giovanni Maria's*, to exchange for some of the English, and particularly for a few new "ballata," or music for State entries.

Two things are to be chiefly noted in this letter.

1. That the organ-playing at King Henry's court admitted of great improvement, and called for better performers.
2. A Giovanni Maria of Venice is introduced. Of whom presently.

1.—As to the organ-playing. John Paduanus of Verona, the maker of wonderful sun-dials, was also very well qualified "to render the King" [as the patent specifies] "good service" in this department of "*Res Musica*."

In the dedication of one of his treatises to the Bishop of Torcelli, he says:—"It has been the peculiar, almost the natural, privilege of several members of my family to be of much use to churchmen, chiefly bishops, and thereby to become their clients and confidential friends. Not to mention still earlier instances, my father Francis, to the very end of his life, helped the Monks of Olivet, at Verona, in adapting sacred music to the *organ* in their Church. My uncle, Blasius, himself a member of the Helenian Brotherhood, as long

as he lived—and he lived to his 86th year—did the same for them in the principal Church of their city, to the universal satisfaction of the citizens. He likewise was the author of two volumes of very great utility to young students in music. . . . *I also have followed in the steps of my relatives, by filling the same office as my father for the Olivetans."*

Of his own passion for music he gives, in another of his little writings, the following account:—"I was born in 1516. Both my parents died when I was of tender age, but an uncle took care of me. Having but slender means I was sent into the country for maintenance; but that kind of life not pleasing me I went to Ferrara to learn music, my paternal art." He adds that "he retained the strongest impression of his father's brilliant performance on the organ in the Church of St. Mary. It was such as would have tamed any bear or Hyrcanian wild beast."

If then there were any human animals of this sort in King Henry's Court at Greenwich, here were several of the De Padua or Padovani family capable of playing the part of Orpheus.

King Henry's fine ear and partiality for the organ would not be likely to allow him to put up very long with the bad playing of the year 1515: and though he could not at that time have employed as a reformer this John Paduanus of Verona, who was not born till 1516, he might very well have engaged him when 26 years of age, in 1542, when (according to the first patent) our John of Padua's musical services began.

2.—If, however, it should be thought (as it probably may), that I have not succeeded in identifying this John Paduanus of Verona with the John of Padua we are in search of, I have another string to my bow: a second claimant, in the person of the "*Giovanni Maria*" of Venice, spoken of above in Nicolo Sagudino's letter from the English Court, as a foreigner to whom they looked for compositions in music for state entries and dances. Now this Giovanni Maria's family name was also "De Padua," or "Padovani."

The late Mr. Rawdon Browne, well known for his elaborate researches into Venetian archives, being applied to for some possible information about *any* "John of Padua," was so obliging as to obtain

from the Marchese Selvatico some particulars that throw considerable light upon the subject. The Marchese said:—"He could not find in their national documents or histories any mention exactly of an architect of that name: but there was a John Padova, of Milan, a scholar of Solari, a carver of figures in 1524; though no mention of his having gone to England. There was also a *Giovanni Maria Padovan*, very clever as a sculptor, a moulder and maker of medals. He wrote his name John Maria Patavinus.¹ He worked in sculpture at Padua and at Venice, but of his being an architect nothing is said. It is, however (says the Marchese), not impossible that he was one, because all the eminent artists of the Revival Period were often well accomplished in all the three arts. As he was also employed in 1548 by the King of Poland to construct a magnificent mausoleum, for which he was liberally rewarded, this would allow us to presume that he was also an able architect, seeing that the sepulchres of that period seldom consisted of sculpture only, but required to be constructed according to the rules of architecture."²

Novel and most fanciful decorative work was precisely the sort that King Henry used in profusion at Nonsuch palace, so that if this Giovanni Maria, "a clever sculptor and moulder," at Venice, was able, as he was, to supply King Henry with this, and also with *new music* of the lighter sort for state concerts, we have in him at once the very qualifications for which Henry conferred an annual pension, as stated in the letters patent of 1544, viz., for having rendered, and intending to render, great service in architecture and new musical compositions. The Italian biographies, it is true, do not speak of his having gone to England; but this presents no difficulty: for an Italian residing at home might, in return for musical compositions, and architectural devices sent to England, receive English pay at Venice as easily as in London.

Of the John Padova of *Milan*, mentioned above by the Marchese

¹ Mr. Rawdon Browne says, in a private letter:—"I believe the name of "Mosca," by which this man was generally known, was a surname, from his having built the Kremlin, and it then became a family name: but its architects could have had nothing to do with Longleat."

² An engraving of this mausoleum, if there is one, would supply a specimen of the architectural taste of this "John Maria Padovani."

Selvatico, nothing is known, either as to his having been an architect, or of his having visited England, or his knowledge of music, a chief service for which, according to the letters patent, our "John de Padua" was paid.

Our choice, then, seems rather to lie between the other two persons of the same name and family: John Padovani, of Verona, the maker of sun-dials, &c., and player on the organ; but of whose skill in architecture we know nothing: and John Maria Padovani, of Venice, who was architect enough to embellish with sculptured ornaments, and probably to build a royal mausoleum in Poland: and who was a very celebrated musical composer, especially of "ballate" and entertainments of a lighter sort, suited to amuse a court.

The reader is at full liberty to choose which of the two he thinks the more likely to have been our "John of Padua." He will, perhaps, be glad to shelter himself under Mr. Daines Barrington's opinion: viz., "That John of Padua had most likely come from Italy as a performer on some instrument, and by accident only was employed by Henry VIII. as an architect."

II.—The *Second* point I proposed to deal with in this paper was, What probability is there that John of Padua—and this applies to either of the two Padovani above named—had anything to do with the building of Longleat?

"Longleat" [says Mr. Digby Wyatt¹] "scarcely answers one's expectation of what a regularly-educated Italian architect's work was likely to have been." But this may easily be explained. Longleat was commenced just at the time when Classical feelings began to revive in England. English architects went to Italy to study Classical style: and Longleat appears to be one of the earliest, if not the very earliest, example of a house designed, either by an Italian desirous of combining Italian with English, or, *vice versâ*, an Englishman combining English with Italian, architecture. The large windows of many lights, with mullions and transoms, cannot be called Italian, being very rarely to be met with there: whilst, on

¹ In page 234 of the "Essay, &c.," above referred to.

the other hand, the Classical features of the house were, before the Revival, almost unknown in English domestic architecture.

The actual circumstances under which Longleat was built are not generally known.

In the first place, the present house is not the original Longleat erected by Sir John Thynne. The present house dates from 1568, but there was one before it on the same site, begun twenty years earlier. This disappeared: and how much or how little the present house resembles it, must of course be to a certain extent (for some points of resemblance are known), a matter of conjecture. The history of the founder's building operations, so far as can now be collected from letters and other documents of the period, is as follows:—

LONGLEAT THE FIRST.

In the year 1540 Sir John Thynne purchased the dissolved Priory of Longleat. What the Priory House was like it is impossible to say, no drawing of it being left. The number of the religious brethren having been small their house would probably be not very large. There was a chapel, which was retained; and much of the house was certainly utilized. But Sir John does not appear to have begun any alterations at all until the year 1547 (the last of King Henry the Eighth's reign, and the first of Protector Somerset's greatness): from which year, it is quite certain from the evidence of old correspondence and other papers still forthcoming, that by degrees, and with continual interruption from public and domestic affairs, he went on for more than twenty years, first with one piece of work, then with another, often changing his mind, doing and undoing, till at last he ended by producing one of the finest houses in the country. His steward, writing from the place to his master, says:—"I think no less than that your house now to see to, is, and will be by it is finished, the first house and handsomest of that size within the compass of four shires round about the same, and so doth all the country report. Some pleased, some grieved." No plan or full description of it has survived: but there are some letters of the year 1547, when Sir John Thynne began the alteration of the old priory, and of the two following years, from which the first Longleat would appear to have been

in some respects of the same style as the present house, with this known exception, viz., that the uppermost story consisted of a row of gables, such as are seen on some parts of the present house on the inner side facing the courts. But there is no mention of any general designer, or of any person whom we of the present day should call an architect. In the letters alluded to Sir John gives his own orders for everything, with incessant counter-orders and fresh instructions. Among other alterations to the old priory, there is "a room to be built over the old chapel," and a "New Lodging of many bedrooms," to have "gables" with figures of animals on the points, to be worked "by John Chapman," a local workman, who, when he has finished at Longleat, is sent for to be employed for similar carving of animals at Lacock Abbey, then Sir William Sharington's. In 1547 a Charles Williams, who had travelled over Italy, writes to offer his services in supplying internal decorations, "after the Italian fashion." In 1554 another "New Lodging" is commenced, in which a person is employed for decoration, whose name is not given: but there are two letters from Sir William Cavendish and his wife (Bess Hardwick) to Sir John, requesting the use of this "cunning playsterer," who, they hear, "had made "dyverse pendants and other pretty things, and had flowered the hall at Longleat," to do like work for them at Hardwick. This was *old* Hardwick House, now a ruin, but on the walls of it are still to be seen large florid decorations in plaster-work, which, no doubt, are the very work of this man. Presently, in 1559, follows a third and expensive piece of "New Building," the original contract for which with one William Spicer, of Nunney (in Co. Somerset, a few miles from Longleat), still exists: and in this it is distinctly stated that the work is to be executed "according to a plan agreed upon between Sir John Thynne and himself." In this are named "chimnies of columns 17ft. high" (such as are on the present house): and large windows of many lights, "all of the forefront to be of like moulding as the great window is of, that is now there." The dimensions of that pattern great window, with the number of transoms, mullions, &c., are precisely given, and they correspond almost to an inch with the actual large windows now at Longleat. *Architraves, friezes,*

pilasters, capitals, and bases are also specified. There was also a hall 30ft. wide, and a long gallery in the second story on the *north* side, 120ft. long, and 17ft. wide. All this certainly shows that the first house was very much of the same style as the present one. Yet though the names of persons employed in the work are given, and a Mr. Throckmorton comes occasionally to see the work is right, there is not the slightest allusion to any architect or designer.

This first house came to a very untimely end. After sundry escapes it was almost utterly destroyed by fire on 21st April, 1567. The catastrophe is distinctly mentioned at the beginning of the building accounts of the present house: and there are letters in which Sir John received the condolence of his friends. It is also mentioned in an early edition of Camden's "*Britannia*," translated by Philemon Holland, who, speaking of Longleat, says:—"Although once or twice it hath been burnt, it hath risen eftsones¹ more fair." Sir R. C. Hoare, in his history of this place,² does not mention this fire, and indeed seems not to have known at all that there had been any former house. Yet in the original document which he was copying and has printed, and which is in the handwriting of the first Lord Weymouth, a few words occur which, had he observed them, would have informed him of it. The paper begins thus:—"Sir John Thynne built Longleat with his own stone and timber, *and the materials of the former house which was burnt.*"³

LONGLEAT THE SECOND.

Sir John Thynne's patience and purse were not exhausted; and presently, like the unextinguishable phoenix, Longleat the Second rose from the ashes of its predecessor, fairer than before. After allowing nine months for clearing the ground and other preparations,

¹ "Eftsones," *i.e.*, immediately after.

² "*Modern Wilts*," Heytesbury, p. 72.

³ The materials of a burnt house do not, generally speaking, go very far towards a new one. Sir John purchased from the Audley family an acre and a half of land on Box Hill, out of which the stone was fetched for the present house. The workmen now on the spot informed the writer that the vein of stone used for Sir John's purpose is one of the very best that the Box quarries yield.

the present house began to be built in January, 1568, and was still unfinished at his death, in 1580.

The building account books are in good preservation, but, once more, there is not a word about any John of Padua. I am very much of opinion that the general design of the former house was repeated, with probably some variation and enlargement, and that no one had more to do with the plan than Sir John Thynne himself.

There is a very strong confirmation of this idea in a strange half-satirical half-facetious effusion (still preserved), from the pen of a Wiltshire gentleman of rather evil notoriety in that day, Wild Will Darell, of Littlecote Hall. In this crazy composition the house is supposed to be making an Address to its founder, Sir John. It jeers him for its pretentious appearance, and for the toil and trouble he had himself been at in erecting it. Here is a specimen :—" But now, see him that by these thirty years almost *with such turmoyle of mind hath been thynking of me, framing and erecting me, musing many a time with great care*, and now and then pulling down this and that part of me, to enlarge sometimes a foot, or some few inches, upon a conceit, or this or that man's speech not worth a woodcock's brains: and by and by" [which, according to the sense of the expression at that time, meant *directly, all at once*] "beating down windows for this or that fault, they knew not why nor wherefore." Another passage of this "wild" production speaks of "this Dorick, this Tuscan fashion: my quadrants, my ascendances, my columns with a geometrical proportion": also of "my unquiet, besides many times assailed with that ungracious enemy of fire and at last almost utterly consumed with that facility coming from above that it was miraculous."¹

At the beginning of the building of the present house a person of the name of Moore was the head man, and received the highest pay: but he was very soon superseded by another of some eminence. There is an original letter at Longleat from a Mr. Humphrey Lovell to Sir John Thynne, dated 11th March, 1568, "recommending Mr. Robert Smithson who had been employed by Mr. Vice-Chamberlain

¹ Does this mean that the first house was struck by lightning?

as principal freemason." He was at once engaged by Sir John Thynne. It is impossible to say how far Robert Smithson merely executed work according to plans already provided for him : or how far he may have assisted in arranging and finally settling the plans : but it is remarkable that he was the man who built Wollaton House, in Nottinghamshire, and on his monument in the parish Church there, where he was buried, it is recorded that he was "the Architector and Surveyor unto the most worthy House of Wollaton with divers others of great account."

The late Mr. John Britton considered the two houses so remarkably alike that, in his opinion, they must have been the production of one and the same mind. Another writer¹ sees so many minute differences in details, that he is of a contrary opinion. So, in architecture, as in medicine, doctors differ. It is true that Wollaton, having been built a few years later than the other, has more ornament ; still, the general observer cannot help being struck with a very strong resemblance between them : and would probably conclude that they were really the work of one and the same architect, who, naturally, would not make them precisely the same, but would give them the sisterly likeness which Ovid gives to his sea-nymphs, "not exactly the same features, yet not very different" :—

"facies non omnibus una
Nec diversa tamen ; qualem decet esse sororum."

(*Metam.*, II., l. 13.)

The word "Architector," used on the monument to Robert Smithson, may mean, not the modern architect, but merely the builder. R. Smithson certainly was not employed upon the first Longleat, so that if that first house was (as by the notice of "friezes, architraves, capitals, bases, &c.," it appears to have been), of the same Italian-English or English-Italian style as the present one, Smithson could not have been the original designer. That person must have been, as already suggested, either an Italian, or an Englishman educated in Italy, whose object was to combine both

¹ See "The Builder," 13th May, 1882.

styles. But the general character of the first house having been adopted for the second, it may have been more fully developed under Robert Smithson's superintendence.

As to "John de Padua," whether a John Padovani of Verona, of Venice, or of Milan, there is among the Longleat papers not the slightest reference to his having either designed, or having been consulted as the work went on, or of his having received any money for services, either for the first, or the second house at Longleat.

In the great research that is now going on among public and private historical documents something may yet be discovered to establish his claim, but the records at Longleat itself are silent.

J. E. JACKSON.

The Names of the Nobility, Gentry, and others in the County of Wilts, who contributed to the Defence of the Country at the time of the Spanish Armada Invasion, in 1588.¹

(Contributed by MR. WALTER MONEY, F.S.A.)

March.	John Thistlethwayte [? Winterslow]	the 8 of March	£25
	Sir Walter Hungerford [Farley Castle]	the 10 of March	50
	Edward Hungerford	the same day	25
	Edward Horton [? of Iford, Bradford]	the same day	50
	John Longe, Sen. [Wraxall]	the 14 of March	25
	Roger Blagden [? Blackden, of Kingswood]	the same day	25
	Edward Longe [? Monkton]	the 15 of March	25
	John Trusloe [? Hampworth, of Avebury afterwards]	the 16 of March	25

¹ King's Lib., Brit. Mus., 194, a. 22.